

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**


INSIGHT INVESTMENTS LLC,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. CIV-20-788-G
)	
NORTH AMERICAN SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY,)	
)	
)	
Defendant.)	

ORDER

Now before the Court is Defendant’s unopposed Motion (Doc. No. 19) requesting suspension of its deadline to answer or otherwise respond to Plaintiff’s Amended Complaint. Defendant asks the Court to hold this deadline “in abeyance” pending adjudication of its Partial Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 8) the claims asserted in Plaintiff’s original Complaint. Defendant suggests that this course of action will “promote judicial economy” and “serve the best interests of the parties to this litigation.” Def.’s Mot. (Doc. No. 19), at 2.

Defendant’s Motion is DENIED in accordance with the well-settled rule that an amended complaint supersedes an earlier filed complaint and “renders it of no legal effect.” *Davis v. TXO Prod. Corp.*, 929 F.2d 1515, 1517 (10th Cir. 1991) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Defendant’s Partial Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 8) is DENIED as moot. Defendant is DIRECTED to answer or otherwise respond to the Amended Complaint (Doc. No. 15) within 7 days of this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 29th day of October, 2020.



CHARLES B. GOODWIN
United States District Judge